R E P O R T R E S U M E S

ED 013 285 UD 004 094

EVALUATION OF ESEA TITLE I PROJECTS OF CALIFORNIA SCHOOLS--SUMMARY OF ANNUAL REPORT, 1965-1966.

BY- LAW, ALEXANDER I. MADDEN, VINCENT J.
CALIFORNIA STATE DEPT. OF EDUCATION, SACRAMENTO

PUB DATE 67

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.25 HC-$1.28 32P.

DESCRIPTORS- *COMPENSATORY EDUCATION PROGRAMS, *DISADVANTAGED YOUTH, *EVALUATION, *PROJECTS, *PUBLIC SCHOOLS, ANNUAL REPORTS, FEDERAL PROGRAMS, SCHOOL SERVICES, ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION ACT, ESEA TITLE I, CALIFORNIA, SERVICES FOR EXPECTANT MOTHERS PROJECT, MORE CAPABLE STUDENTS PROJECT, STUDENT TEACHER RATIO PROJECT, EXPLORATORY WORK EXPERIENCE PROJECT

THE PROGRESS OF THE 1965 ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION ACT (ESEA) TITLE I COMPENSATORY EDUCATION PROJECTS IN 1,044 CALIFORNIA SCHOOL DISTRICTS IS SUMMARIZED IN THIS REPORT. THE FIRST SECTION GIVES AN OVERVIEW OF THE PROJECTS AND DISCUSSES FUND ALLOCATIONS AND SUCH PROBLEMS AS LACK OF STAFF AND THE TIGHT TIME SCHEDULE DUE TO DELAYED CONGRESSIONAL ACTION ON FUND APPROPRIATIONS. TWO RELATIVELY NEW IDEAS FOR THE EFFECTIVE OPERATION OF LOCAL PROJECTS ALSO ARE PRESENTED--(1) INVOLVEMENT OF COMMUNITY ORGANIZATIONS IN THE DEVELOPMENT OF PROJECTS, AND (2) PROVISION OF ESEA TITLE I SERVICES TO NONPUBLIC SCHOOL CHILDREN. THE SECOND SECTION OF THE REPORT ANALYZES AND EVALUATES THE PROJECTS IN GENERAL AND DISCUSSES SOME OF THEIR SPECIFIC ACTIVITIES. THE THREE MOST COMMON OBJECTIVES OF THE PROJECTS WERE TO PROVIDE REMEDIAL ACTIVITIES, CULTURAL ENRICHMENT, AND SUPPORTIVE AND AUXILIARY SERVICES. SPECIFIC EFFORTS WERE MADE TO REDUCE THE TEACHER'S WORK LOAD AND TO TEACH ENGLISH AS A SECOND LANGUAGE. THIS SECTION ALSO CONTAINS A DISCUSSION OF THE PROJECTS' READING ACHIEVEMENT PROGRAMS. IN THE REPORT'S FINAL SECTION THERE ARE SPECIFIC DESCRIPTIONS OF FOUR SAMPLE PROJECTS AND DISCUSSIONS OF SOME INNOVATIVE PROGRAMS--SERVICES FOR EXPECTANT MOTHERS, MORE CAPABLE STUDENTS, STUDENT-TEACHER RATIO, AND EXPLORATORY WORK EXPERIENCE. THE GENERALLY FAVORABLE ANECDOTAL COMMENTS OF VARIOUS PROJECT PERSONNEL ALSO ARE REPORTED. (LB)

ED013285

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

MUST E

VD 004094

Summary of Annual Report 1965-1966

Evaluation of ESEA Title I Projects of California Schools

CALIFORNIA STATE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
MAX RAFFERTY-Superintendent of Public Instruction
Sacramento 1967

Summary of Annual Report 1965-1966

Evaluation of ESEA Title I Projects of California Schools

FOREWORD

This report of the evaluation of pupils' progress in the compensatory education programs offered by California schools during the 1965-66 school year contains data that may be used to advantage by the schools that are offering compensatory education programs as well as those that are planning to offer such programs. I hope that every person who has responsibility for the development or operation of a compensatory education program will find in this report some information that he can use to advantage in meeting his responsibility.

Max Rafferty

Superintendent of Public Instruction

PREFACE

An annual evaluation of California's program under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, Title I, is required by federal legislation and by state legislation (the McAteer Act of 1965). The Office of Compensatory Education is responsible for disseminating information on ESEA activities designed to strengthen the educational program for disadvantaged children.

California's ESEA, Title I, projects were initiated in the spring and summer of 1966. Because the projects have been in operation for less than a year, few definite conclusions are possible, or should be expected. The ultimate benefit of compensatory education programs cannot be known for years, perhaps not until the children involved reach adulthood. This evaluation, therefore, reports on the types of educational activities implemented under ESEA, Title I, and some of the preliminary results and observations.

This report is based upon 837 evaluations submitted by 1,044 school districts that operated projects--essentially a 100 percent return because some districts cooperated on a project and submitted one evaluation, other districts were unified on July 1, and some districts operated only summer projects.

The information collected from school districts was objectively coded, key-punched, and put on magnetic tapes in a computer. The computer was programmed to perform the necessary tallies, cross-tallies, and arithmetic computations to yield the summarized information which was analyzed for this report.

Major responsibility for preparation of this annual report was assumed by Alexander I. Law and J. Vincent Madden, Education Research and Evaluation consultants, Office of Compensatory Education.

WILSON C. RILES
Associate Superintendent of Public Instruction; and Director, Office of Compensatory Education

THOMAS A. SHELLHAMMER
Chief, Bureau of Compensatory Education Program Evaluation

ADVISORY COMPENSATORY EDUCATION COMMISSION

Chairman
Joseph D. Lohman
Dean, School of Criminology
University of California
Berkeley

Executive Secretary
Wilson C. Riles
Director, Office of
Compensatory Education
State Department
of Education

Andrew Billingsley, Assistant Professor of Social Welfare, University of California, Berkeley

Robert L. Docter, Associate Professor of Education, San Fernando Valley State College, Northridge

Ralph Guzman, Assistant Director, Mexican-American Study Project, University of California, Los Angeles

Rt. Rev. Msgr. Franklin F. Hurd, Superintendent of Schools, Diocese of San Diego, Santee

Mrs. David Joseph, Director, Neighborhood Study Centers, Community Welfare Council, Sacramento

"J" Eugene McAteer, State Senator, San Francisco

H. M. McPherson, retired school superintendent, Napa

Zane Meckler, Executive Director, American Jewish Committee, Northwest Region, San Francisco

Alfred W. Newman, Representative, California School Boards Association, Vallejo

Henry Paul, M.D., Los Angeles

Isadore Pivnick, Supervisor of Compensatory Education, San Francisco Unified School District

Octavio I. Romano V, Department of Behavioral Sciences, University of California, Berkeley

Leo J. Ryan, State Assemblyman, South San Francisco

Mrs. Joseph Wyatt, civic leader, Pasadena

CONTENTS

	Page
Foreword	*iii*
Preface	*v*
Advisory Compensatory Education Commission	*vi*
AN OVERVIEW	1
California's ESEA Allocation	1
Some of the Problems	2
Time Schedule	2
Lack of Staff	3
Misunderstanding of Intent	3
Two New Concepts	3
Involvement of Community	3
Nonpublic Schools	4
THE FINDINGS	5
Analysis of Project Activities	5
Evaluation of the Projects	7
Reading Achievement in ESEA Programs	11
Approaches Used	11
Evaluation Techniques	11
Some Generalizations	12
Activities in the Projects	13
Counseling	13
Ancillary Services	13
Teacher Load	13
English as a Second Language	13
Summary of Activities	14
SAMPLES OF ESEA PROJECTS	16
Sample ESEA, Title I, Projects	16
Project for Mexican-Americans	16
ESEA, Title I, Project in Suburban Area	16

	Page
Projects in Agricultural Area	17
Project in a Metropolitan Area	18
Anecdotal Records from Project Reports	19
Reading Program	19
Teacher Aides	19
Reading Laboratory	19
Study Trip	20
Hearing Defects	21
Experimental Mathematics	21
Attendance Project	21
Staff Attitudes	22
Innovative ESEA, Title I, Projects	22
Services for Expectant Mothers	22
More Capable Students	23
Student-Teacher Ratio	23
Exploratory Work Experience	24

AN OVERVIEW

In 1965 the United States Congress passed the Elementary and Secondary Education Act in the first nationwide effort to combat poverty by strengthening the school program for children handicapped by poverty.

Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act authorizes grants of money to school districts for projects designed to increase the educational achievement of children in families with low incomes. These funds allow California to extend its pilot compensatory education program to children wherever they may be located--in public schools or private schools, in urban slums or in rural shacks.

The aim of compensatory education is to ensure that every child receive an equal opportunity to succeed to the full extent of his potential, regardless of his economic, ethnic, social, or cultural background. To achieve this aim, the schools must often give special attention to those children who have educational needs that cannot be met by the regular instructional program. These children, most raised in poverty, are helped to succeed in school through services and activities provided by compensatory education programs.

California's ESEA Allocation

California's allocation of funds under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, Title I, was $77,975,730 for the 1965-66 school year, with 1,205 school districts eligible to apply for funds. Money was allocated to each district according to the number of students it had who came from families with low incomes.

The following statistics reveal the extent to which California's school districts took advantage of the federal funds: A total of 1,044 school districts participated in the first year's program and received approval for $73,819,443 for 1,353 separate projects. The remaining 161 districts did not choose to apply for their share of the funds.

In California, 289,382 children participated in the ESEA, Title I, program; 258,761 were enrolled in public schools, 19,817 were enrolled in nonpublic schools, and 10,804 were preschool children, high school dropouts, and others not enrolled in regular schools. The average expenditure per child in the ESEA program was $255, which is about half the amount spent per child in the regular instructional program in California. This means that children participating in Title I projects received educational services which were approximately 50 percent above what they normally receive in the regular school program.

Funds for projects ranged from a low of $252.67 for one disadvantaged child in a one-teacher school in the mountains to $15,130,384.94 for 49,714 children in the Los Angeles Unified School District.

ESEA, Title I, projects were developed for children and youths of all ages--from the child who had not yet entered kindergarten to the teenager who had already dropped out of high school. The majority of the projects were in elementary schools, especially in the second, third, and fourth grades, and parents of pupils receiving compensatory education oftentimes were involved.

Some of the Problems

ESEA, Title I, funds did not become available until late fall of 1965, and California projects were initiated in the spring and summer of 1966. A survey of 100 randomly selected school districts indicated that 6 percent operated their projects for one month or less; 12 percent, from one to two months; 35 percent, from two to three months; 42 percent, from three to four months; and 5 percent, from four to five months. The average length of time that California projects were operated was 14 weeks or three and a half months.

To get projects under way, school districts were forced to develop and to implement their plans quickly. Problems resulted, and these compounded the problems inherent in starting any new educational program. The lack of time for adequate planning was a hardship for both the Office of Compensatory Education and the school districts implementing the ESEA, Title I, program during the first year. Although some districts--most of them in urban areas--had experimented with compensatory education programs during the past few years, the concept of special activities to meet the needs of disadvantaged children was new to most districts. Some of the most common problems reported by the school districts are identified in the paragraphs that follow.

Time Schedule. Late Congressional action on appropriations meant that districts had to start new programs in the middle of a school year. Therefore, personnel, especially specialists such as reading teachers, psychologists, counselors, and bilingual teachers, were difficult to find. As a result of the new program, manufacturers were flooded with orders for newly developed equipment and curriculum materials. Delivery delays naturally caused delays in the implementation of projects. In many cases, districts had to revise their Title I projects because of a lack of personnel or equipment and materials.

The time schedule also prevented school districts from bolstering Title I projects with district funds, because local resources were committed in late spring when school budgets are usually developed. Many districts reported that they could have developed broader and more comprehensive compensatory education programs if they had been able to coordinate school district funds with ESEA funds to a greater degree. For the 1966-67 school year, many districts have budgeted district funds to supplement ESEA funds.

Lack of Staff. School districts, particularly small ones, often lacked personnel with the background and knowledge to plan, implement, and evaluate a compensatory education program. Some of the districts that did not apply for funds listed lack of time and qualified personnel to plan projects as their reasons for nonparticipation. To combat the personnel problem, the staff of the Office of Compensatory Education conducted workshops and conferences to orient district staffs to the program. Whenever possible, consultants in the Office of Compensatory Education provided assistance to individual districts in planning a project that would be effective in meeting the district's needs. In some instances, personnel in offices of county superintendents of schools assisted districts with the development and writing of project applications, but this help was limited because funds could not be allocated to offices of county superintendents of schools to provide such services except by contract with the school district.

Misunderstanding of Intent. Some districts did not understand the intent of ESEA, Title I, and developed general aid programs rather than programs focused on disadvantaged children. The Office of Compensatory Education stipulated that funds had to be spent where the schools served the largest percent of children with educational disadvantages. Before being approved, a project had to have the potential of giving concentrated services to children with the greatest need. Spreading the funds and services throughout the district would not have resulted in significant improvement in the achievement levels of the children. Many of the districts were faced with the difficult task of ranking their schools within designated target areas. The Title I funds allocated to them were insufficient to include all the children who could have qualified for compensatory assistance.

Two New Concepts

Title I of ESEA brought attention to two relatively new concepts in public school operation: (1) involving organizations in poverty areas in the development of projects; and (2) involving children from nonpublic schools in public school activities.

Involvement of Community. The federal legislation requires coordination and cooperation between school districts and local community action agencies of the Office of Economic Opportunity in the planning of ESEA, Title I, projects. The purposes of coordination are to avoid duplication of services provided under ESEA, Title I, and under the Economic Opportunity Act and to promote the most efficient use of resources under both acts. The need for coordination is evident from the fact that 553 ESEA, Title I, projects involving $47,065,000 were in districts serving areas where there were also community action programs under the Economic Opportunity Act.

Most districts reported success in working with community action agencies, although there were problems which, hopefully, will be alleviated in subsequent years of operation. District personnel believe that school-community relationships were improved when community groups participated in developing ESEA, Title I, programs. Among projects invclving both ESEA, Title I, and Economic Opportunity Act funds were Headstart-Title I

preschool programs, high school dropout programs sponsored by the school district and the Neighborhood Youth Corps, and community action agency programs to recruit and train teacher aides for Title I projects.

The districts reported that the problems of working out cooperative relationships with community-action agencies were due to the inexperience of both groups in working with each other and to a lack of a clear definition of the extent of the community action agency's role in Title I projects. When the Title I program was initiated, many community action agencies were not yet established or did not have enough trained personnel to work with school districts in developing educational projects. Some school districts were inexperienced in working with community groups and had difficulties establishing effective lines of communication.

The biggest problem was the lack of a clear definition of coordination and cooperation. Some community action agencies interpreted the terms coordination and cooperation to mean veto power over school district Title I projects; this interpretation was not inherent in the federal legislation. Also, it was not clear whether the Economic Opportunity Act or ESEA, Title I, authorized funds for the various programs in target areas.

Nonpublic Schools. The federal requirement that children in nonpublic schools be given an opportunity to participate in ESEA, Title I, programs also opened up channels of communications between public and nonpublic school officials.

About 8 percent of the children participating in ESEA, Title I, activities in California last year were enrolled in nonpublic schools, most of them parochial schools. The most successful activities involving nonpublic school children were those operated on nonpublic school facilities. These activities included auxiliary services such as health, psychological, and counseling programs and remedial instruction, given by ESEA, Title I, teachers who traveled to the nonpublic schools for a specified time each day or week. Cultural enrichment activities were also common projects involving children in both public and nonpublic schools.

The federal legislation specifies that the public schools are to have control over the employees and the equipment funded by ESEA, Title I, and are to provide the same services to the children enrolled in nonpublic schools as the public school children receive.

THE FINDINGS

In evaluating the projects conducted under ESEA, Title I, in California during 1965-66, the Office of Compensatory Education analyzed the project activities and evaluated the projects; and in making its evaluations, the Office gave particular attention to reading achievement, a major activity of the ESEA, Title I, program.

Analysis of Project Activities

The types of activities that school districts conducted under ESEA, Title I, projects and the percent of these projects which had the activity as its primary, secondary, or other objective are shown in Table 1.

Since the categories of primary, secondary, and other are mutually exclusive, adding the percents of the three categories would be misleading. Secondary and other activities were implemented, in most cases, to support the objectives of the primary activity. For example, a district's project may have had as its primary objective the improvement of reading skills. Its primary activity was categorized as remedial and corrective. To achieve the objective, the district hired teacher aides to free the teacher to work more intensively with individual students. A reduced teacher load would be the project's secondary activity. In addition, the project may have included strengthening library facilities, diagnosing the causes of a child's reading problem, and having cultural study trips to broaden children's backgrounds. Supportive and auxiliary services and cultural enrichment would be designated as other activities of the project.

The activities were identified by projects and not by districts. Some districts operated several projects, and each of these had a primary activity. Another district conducting the same activities, but under one project, may have had only one primary activity and several secondary and other activities.

The projects were developed to meet the specific needs of children from impoverished families; therefore, the rank order in which districts chose activities as their primary objective would reflect the needs of disadvantaged children in California.

The most common activities were of the remedial and corrective type. (See Table 1.) Included in the remedial and corrective activity are remedial reading, communication skills or language skills, curriculum development, English for non-English-speaking students, remedial mathematics and arithmetic, and development of skills in other academic subjects.

Table 1

Activities of ESEA, Title I, Projects in California, 1965-66

Type of activity	Percent of projects having activity as objective, according to degree of activity		
	Primary	Secondary	Other
Preschool	3.9	1.8	2.2
Remedial and corrective	47.5	21.4	11.4
Supportive and auxiliary services (such as libraries, special education, and speech therapy)	9.9	7.6	13.0
Guidance and counseling services	5.1	9.8	11.0
Health education services	1.2	2.2	3.4
School-community coordination	2.3	2.1	3.2
Cultural enrichment	10.3	12.8	16.2
Reduction of teacher load	7.7	23.4	16.2
Study centers and tutoring services	4.1	4.4	1.7
Inservice training of staff	5.7	6.5	18.8
Attitude change	1.8	6.4	5.2
Dropout reduction	0.04	0.3	0.2

Cultural enrichment was a primary objective of 10.3 percent of the projects reported by districts. Generally, cultural enrichment is a secondary or other activity, as reflected in the higher percent of projects which implemented cultural enrichment programs to supplement the primary objective. Included in this activity are study trips, speeches, development and acquisition of aesthetic materials, creative expression, outdoor education, and, on a few occasions, summer field trips.

Supportive and auxiliary services were listed in 9.9 percent of the district reports as a primary objective, making this activity the third most common. Included in this activity were acquisition of library materials, special counseling, physical education activities, and speech therapy.

A reduced teacher load made possible by the employment of teacher assistants, classroom aides, and clerical help was reported as the primary objective in 7.7 percent of the district projects. This activity was a secondary objective in 23.4 percent of the projects and the other objective in 16.2 percent of the projects.

Inservice training of staff was a primary objective of 5.7 percent of the projects. Like reduction of teacher load, inservice training was more common as a secondary or other objective and was offered to increase the effectiveness of the teacher in raising student achievement level.

Guidance and counseling services were the primary objective of 5.1 percent of the projects. These services included those of psychometrist assistants, home counselors, and evening counseling centers, as well as psychological testing and group and individual counseling.

In 4.1 percent of the projects, study centers and tutoring services were designated as the primary objective. Among the programs implemented were after-school and Saturday study centers, study clinics, and in-school tutoring.

Preschool classes were a primary objective of 3.9 percent of the projects. This low percent of preschool projects was due to the availability of funds under the Unruh Preschool Act of 1965 and the Economic Opportunity Act's Headstart Program.

Activities to improve school-community coordination constituted the primary objective of 2.3 percent of the projects. Among the activities are establishment of neighborhood centers and employment of school-community coordinators, program aides, and community organizers.

The attitude change activity encompasses improvement of the student's self-image, his attitude toward school and education, and his motivation to succeed. This activity was the primary objective in 1.2 percent of the projects. This percent is based solely on the projects specifically designed to improve student attitudes. It is inherent in all projects that motivation and interest are essential.

The primary objective of 1.2 percent of the projects was health education services, which included physical examinations, dental examinations, and health care and education.

Projects designed primarily to reduce the number of dropouts accounted for only 0.04 percent of all projects. However, most projects at the secondary school level were aimed at eliminating the things that cause students to leave school before graduation.

Evaluation of the Projects

In judging the degree of success of each project, the Office of Compensatory Education rated the success as "substantial," "some,"

"little," or "not specified." Rigorous standards were applied by the Office in judging the degree of success. To receive a rating of "substantial," a project had to result in growth or change that was statistically significant. This growth had to be demonstrated by a statistical test at or beyond the .05 level of significance, which means that the probability was less than 5 out of 100 that the change in pretest and posttest scores could have occurred by chance. In addition, the district had to use a control or comparison group in evaluating growth.

For a project to receive a rating of "some progress," positive change had to be demonstrated by some objective method, such as test scores, teacher surveys, and attendance records. For the "some progress" rating, growth was recorded, but no statistical tests were conducted on the level of significance.

A rating of "little progress" was given to projects which were evaluated only by subjective methods, or which were funded late in the school year, or which could not be fully implemented because of difficulties in hiring staff or because of delays in delivery of equipment.

The "not specified" rating was applied to projects for which no data were supplied or to projects that did not get started.

Relatively few districts obtained a "substantial progress" rating on their ESEA, Title I, projects for the first year. The growth needed to merit this rating was related to the length of time the projects were operated and the size of the student population tested. The .05 level of confidence was achieved primarily by districts that started their projects in January or February and had large numbers of students in the program.

Since both the "substantial progress" and "some progress" ratings had to be upheld by objective data, it would be appropriate to lump the two categories together for an overall classification of success. Also, during the first semester of operation, subjective evaluations of growth, which have to be rated as "little progress," should not be discounted.

The types of evaluation techniques used and the number of projects using them at each grade level are shown in Tables 2 and 3. Methods of evaluating skill development are presented in Table 2, and techniques used in evaluating projects concerned with changes in attitudes and behavior are presented in Table 3.

Table 2

Methods Used by California School Districts for Evaluating Skill Development in ESEA, Title I, Projects, 1965-66

Evaluation technique used	Number of projects using technique, by grade level						
	Pre-K	1-3	4-6	7-9	10-12	Combined levels	Total
Standardized tests and inventories							
Achievement	5	27	93	3	46	140	314
Intelligence	3	2	1	--	2	4	12
Attitude	1	2	4	--	3	7	17
Other tests							
Achievement--local	5	3	14	1	19	23	65
Other measures							
Teacher ratings	13	24	74	1	26	82	220
Anecdotal record	8	2	9	1	3	31	54
Attendance record	1	--	3	--	5	4	13
Dropout rate	--	--	--	--	--	1	1
Use of facility	--	3	15	--	18	26	62
Questionnaire to students	1	--	1	1	2	3	8
Questionnaire to parents	2	5	18	--	6	17	48

Table 3

Techniques Used by California School Districts for Evaluating Changes in Attitudes and Behavior in ESEA, Title I, Projects, 1965-66

Evaluation technique used	Number of projects using technique, by grade level						
	Pre-K	1-3	4-6	7-9	10-12	Combined levels	Total
Standardized tests and inventories							
Achievement	2	9	26	6	20	29	92
Intelligence	2	2	--	--	--	2	6
Attitude	1	2	7	2	6	22	40
Other tests							
Achievement--local	2	1	5	1	13	13	35
Other measures							
Teacher ratings	8	14	54	4	25	50	155
Anecdotal record	8	1	8	2	6	22	47
Attendance record	1	1	3	1	8	6	20
Dropout rate	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Use of facility	2	1	17	--	10	23	53
Questionnaire to students	2	--	2	--	2	7	13
Questionnaire to parents	2	4	16	--	5	34	61

Reading Achievement in ESEA Programs

The major thrust in the ESEA, Title I, program was in the improvement of students' reading and language skills. Historically, the average child from a low socioeconomic background gains approximately 0.7 of a year's growth for every year of regular classroom instruction. This figure is based on reading test scores. Thus, as the disadvantaged child progresses through the grades, he tends to fall farther and farther behind his middle-class schoolmates.

The typical child receiving help from ESEA, Title I, programs has been behind from the day he entered school. Whatever the factors which put him at a disadvantage--poverty, community attitudes, low educational level of his parents--he does not have the experiences and verbal skills that will permit him to learn at the same rate as the middle-class child.

By the time he enters the third grade, the disadvantaged child is usually a full year behind in reading comprehension and speed--his grade placement might be 2.1 as compared to the average child's 3.1. At the beginning of the eighth grade, his reading grade level, based on a growth rate of 0.7 of a year for every year of instruction, is probably 5.6, not 8.1, which would be the norm. He may soon become a high school dropout.

Approaches Used. A variety of ways to overcome reading deficiencies were tried in ESEA, Title I, programs. Most of the students selected for the programs were at least two years retarded in reading achievement. In many smaller districts, the regular classroom teacher worked intensively with the students, either in small groups or individually. This form of remedial reading usually took place in the regular classroom. Frequently, team teaching, teacher aides, or other means of reducing the student-teacher ratio were employed to provide more time for the classroom teacher to work with remedial reading students. Special textbooks, teaching aids, and, in some cases, mechanical devices facilitated the process.

Larger districts established reading laboratories staffed with reading specialists. Districts with adequate staff and facilities made thorough diagnostic studies of the causes of the student's reading problem before attempting treatment. Often these procedures included diagnosis and individual counseling, hearing and sight testing, and interviews of parents as well as of students.

Although the primary emphasis was on reading, the programs included a broad range of activities. For some programs the number of pupils per teacher was reduced. Counseling and guidance, study trips to enrich the children's backgrounds, development of new curricular materials, new teaching techniques, and improvement of home-school relationships were other aspects of the programs.

Evaluation Techniques. Activities were evaluated by several different techniques, with standardized reading tests being most frequently used. Teacher observations, anecdotal records, locally constructed tests, and teacher ratings were other common evaluation methods. While objective

test scores were usually more readily interpreted, some of the most useful evaluations came from subjective observations.

Two general conclusions are possible from evaluations of ESEA, Title I, reading and language programs:

- During the short time that ESEA, Title I, projects have been in operation, most students have achieved a month's growth for every month of instruction--a substantial increase over the 0.7 of a month's growth for every month of instruction they had been averaging before the program started.

  This month-for-month growth is based on objective test data supplied by districts which operated the reading program for at least four months. This does not mean that students participating in ESEA, Title I, reading programs reached the achievement norm of their grade level after a few months of special instruction, but it does mean that they stopped falling behind. This is a substantial achievement.

- School district personnel generally agree that the students' attitude improved and their motivation and interest in learning increased. Since these are important factors in learning, continued growth may be anticipated. Teachers also reported a positive change in their own attitudes toward these children and in their techniques for working with disadvantaged children.

Some Generalizations. It is too early to single out any one best approach to increasing student achievement. However, several generalizations can be made from the evaluation of the first semester's programs:

- Growth in achievement was highly and positively related to the length of time the children participated in the activity. Districts that were able to implement their projects by January or February reported more significant gains than did districts that did not fully implement their program until March or April.

- The most significant growth derived from projects in which: (1) the students were thoroughly screened and diagnosed to discover the causes of their learning problems; (2) trained specialists were employed to devote full time to eliminating reading difficulties; (3) a variety of approaches, including reading laboratories and special textbooks and materials, were used; and (4) remedial reading activities were conducted for a specified period of time each day in facilities other than the regular classroom.

- Growth seemed least significant in smaller districts where remedial reading was taught in the regular classroom by the regular teacher in small groups for indefinite periods of time during the school day.

- Success appeared to be greatest in grades one through four.

Activities in the Projects

It should be emphasized that projects are listed separately merely to facilitate reporting; all are intended to accomplish a single goal--educational achievement of children from disadvantaged backgrounds. Thus, the projects should be viewed as an intermingling of activities, each activity contributing to gains in the students' achievement level as reflected in the reading test scores. While an intermediate assessment of a student's average gain in reading level was possible, it is not possible in such a short time to assess the specific contribution that each activity made to the student's growth in learning. For example, many districts developed programs of cultural enrichment to broaden the students' backgrounds and to motivate them to learn. Such activities were usually subjectively evaluated by teachers and administrators. Well over 80 percent of these individuals believe that cultural enrichment programs were beneficial. However, it is difficult to assess the degree to which study trips increased the students' achievement.

Counseling. Counseling and guidance services were rated by district staff personnel as effective in improving students' attitudes, behavior, and motivation. Services included group and individual counseling for parents and students and psychological testing of students. About 68 percent of the district staffs surveyed rated the counseling and guidance projects as highly or moderately effective in causing positive behavioral changes. About 32 percent reported that the activities were not fully implemented or were not in operation long enough to permit an assessment.

Ancillary Services. Auxiliary and supportive services, such as library acquisitions, treatment of speech problems, and physical education activities, were also rated--whenever an assessment could be made--as beneficial to the total educational program for disadvantaged children. Evaluation of these activities consisted largely of teacher and administrative observations and anecdotal records. In some cases, evaluation was by the "use of the facility" method; e.g., determining the success of a library project by the number of books checked out or the number of trips made to the library.

Teacher Load. Reduction of teacher load was rated as very successful as far as meeting its objective of allowing teachers more time to work with individuals or small groups of students. Teacher observations and anecdotal records indicated that the employment of extra personnel, such as teacher aides, enabled the teacher to use his professional skills more advantageously. However, reduction of teacher load is not a goal in itself but is a means to the end of raising the achievement level of the students. As indicated by the reading test scores, programs that merely reduced teacher load so the teacher could spend more time on remedial reading did not result in as significant gains as programs that employed a comprehensive range of activities.

English as a Second Language. Because of the large Mexican-American population in California, an important ESEA, Title I, program was teaching English as a second language. Several approaches were used, including

English laboratories and bilingual teachers. Students were motivated and stimulated to listen to English and to speak it. Underlying the listening and speaking activities was the development of the students' ability to think and to form English-language-based concepts.

In some districts, Spanish-speaking children who could not speak English were given intensive instruction in both languages. The assumption was that students would learn English more rapidly when their facility in Spanish--and their pride in the Spanish heritage--was enhanced.

Because the students could not be pretested, programs involving English as a second language were generally not evaluated by objective tests. As an effective evaluation technique, audio tapes were used before and after instruction to gauge the progress that the children had made in oral expression. Generally, pupils who could speak no English before participating in the program gained a reading and sight vocabulary approximating that of an average second-grade English-speaking pupil. Most of the participating pupils were in the fourth through eighth grades.

The program of English as a second language exposed some of the pressing problems that those working with other ESEA, Title I, programs needed to solve. These problems include lack of adequate assessment devices and lack of trained specialists.

Summary of Activities. The types of primary activities and the progress made in them are shown in Table 4. These ratings are merely intermediate assessments based on programs in operation for only a few months. As stated before, the ultimate benefits from compensatory education programs will not be known for many years.

We have relatively few adequate instruments to assess effectively and accurately the needs of disadvantaged students and what they are able to achieve as a result of compensatory education programs. These students are, by definition, "out of phase" with the average student in the average school. It is difficult to assess their academic progress by use of published standardized achievement tests which are geared primarily toward the middle-class child.

It is more difficult to assess changes in the student's behavior, attitude, and perception than it is to measure growth in skill development. It is recommended that the National Advisory Council on the Education of Disadvantaged Children, working in cooperation with large city districts throughout the country and with various state departments of education, attempt as soon as possible to develop appropriate assessment devices for both skill development and attitudinal changes.

Table 4

Progress Report on Primary Activities Conducted by California School Districts in ESEA, Title I, Projects, 1965-66

Type of activity	Number of projects receiving each rating from Office of Compensatory Education*			
	Substantial	Some	Little	Not specified
Preschool	2	16	17	16
Remedial and corrective reading	16	219	276	91
Supportive and auxiliary services; e.g., libraries, special education, and speech therapy	4	19	46	59
Guidance and counseling	--	21	20	18
Health education services	1	7	4	3
School-community coordination	--	21	7	2
Cultural enrichment	5	29	63	36
Reduction of teacher load	--	32	43	24
Study centers and tutoring	2	12	23	16
Inservice training of staff	--	12	18	43
Attitude change	--	10	11	3
Dropout projects	--	4	--	1
Total	30	402	528	312

*See page 8 for a definition of "substantial," "some," "little," and "not specified."

SAMPLES OF ESEA PROJECTS

In ESEA, Title I, projects concerned with the correction of student deficiencies in certain skills and weaknesses in subject matter areas, standardized achievement tests were used as the primary technique to evaluate the students' skills and knowledge of subject matter. However, it is clear that most of the other projects which were developed to assist districts in reaching the goal of raising student achievement levels are not readily amenable to this technique. Valuable data have come from teacher observations of behavioral changes in students, reports from counselors, improved attendance records, reports from parents, and students' health records. Usually these reports, observations, and records are not readily quantifiable. They are difficult to present in tables or charts, and often they are difficult to explain because they represent changes in feelings and attitudes.

This summary would be incomplete, however, if such data were not included. Obviously, a thorough review is not possible, but selected samples of projects, anecdotal records, and innovative projects are presented.

Sample ESEA, Title I, Projects

The projects described in the paragraphs that follow are representative of some of those conducted by school districts with ESEA, Title I, funds.

Project for Mexican-Americans. District A is a relatively small district in an agricultural community in the southwest part of California. Many of the students are bilingual Mexican-Americans. The major emphasis of the Title I project was remedial reading for 100 educationally deprived students whose primary deficiency was in reading. The program was in operation for three months. Remedial reading laboratories were established at two locations. A standardized test showed that the average gain made by all students was five months in the three-month period. A further analysis of test scores indicated that bilingual students gained an average of 4.7 months while other students gained an average of 5.3 months during these three months, as measured by the Gates Basic Reading Test. The project appeared to be well conceived and well executed, and in view of the time involved, growth was substantial. Remedial reading laboratories and diagnostic studies seem to be effective in increasing the reading ability of bilingual students.

ESEA, Title I, Project in Suburban Area. District B, in a suburban area of Los Angeles County, utilized four major activities in its projects: remedial reading, cultural enrichment, health services, and supportive services. Duration of the activities varied from one month to four months.

Staff for the reading program included a psychometrist, nurse, guidance counselor, and special reading teacher. A thorough diagnosis of the reasons for the child's reading disability was made and then remediation was attempted. Only a small number of students in grades four, five, and six participated in the project. Standardized tests as well as specialized tests such as the Bender-Gestalt and the Harris Test of Lateral Dominance were administered. Of the 15 students receiving help at the special learning center, 12 showed a substantial gain and three showed no significant gain. The average gain was four months, which is consistent with the month-per-month growth made by students involved in other projects throughout the state.

The cultural enrichment project consisted of study trips and excursions in the area. Teacher observations and experiential background surveys indicated that the objectives of the project were met.

The health services activities were aimed at improving dietary and sleep habits and encouraging exercising. Home visits and parent conferences were conducted. The objectives appear to have been met.

The guidance counseling staff was increased, and members attempted to help the child develop a better self-image and attitude toward school. The time spent on this activity was relatively short, but the counselors reported significant progress. On the whole, this district appears to have a well-designed and properly executed program, and the use of special reading centers with proper diagnosis of reading problems resulted in positive gains.

Projects in Agricultural Area. District C is a small district in the south-central section of California. It serves a community that is primarily agricultural in nature. Three projects were instituted: preschool classes, remedial and corrective reading, and reduction of teacher load through clerical assistance.

The preschool project was designed for children who were not ready for the first grade and who were deficient in language skills. Project activities included language development, parental involvement, medical services, and hot lunches. Although no formal evaluation by standardized instruments was made, the district kept records of anecdotes, attendance, and parental participation. Of the 20 children who started in the program, 15 entered the first grade, three entered special education classes, one remained in the preschool project, and one moved out of the district.

For the remedial reading project, a special reading teacher, laboratory equipment, and remedial reading materials were used. Children in grades two through eight underwent extensive diagnosis of their reading problems. Personnel providing health and psychological services from the office of the county superintendent of schools cooperated in helping diagnose the children's reading difficulties. After receiving five months of instruction, all students gained substantially. In most cases, the gain was in excess of the month-per-month pattern that was typical throughout the state. The

Durrell-Sullivan Reading Test and the California Achievement Test Battery were supplemented by three other standardized evaluations. Of the 61 students involved, 28 will return to regular classroom work next year and 33 will receive additional remedial work because of their late entry into the program.

In the project to reduce teacher load, a clerk was employed to assist the teachers in preparing classroom materials. No evaluation was made of this project.

Project in a Metropolitan Area. District D serves a community of 100,000 people in an urbanized and industrialized portion of the San Francisco Bay area. About 2,250 students participated in Title I projects, which were in operation for five months. The three major projects were language development, a visiting teacher program, and summer school. The latter is not included in this evaluation.

In the language development project, full-time reading-language specialists were added to the staffs of target area schools to provide individual and small group instruction. A laboratory staffed by two reading specialists and five teachers was established to handle 90 students in a two-hour ungraded class. Tutorial services and cultural enrichment field trips augmented the program. California Achievement Test batteries were administered to students in grades one, two, seven, eight, ten, and eleven. Test results indicated that the gains in the three lower grades were highly significant but that the gains in the three upper grades were not statistically significant.

In the second project, full-time visiting teachers were employed to develop better home-school relationships and to assist teachers in attaining a better understanding of the attitudes and values of parents of disadvantaged children. In 13 of the elementary schools, substitute teachers were also employed for eight weeks to enable the regular classroom teacher to visit the homes and families of the children involved in compensatory education projects. Tests given to control groups were run on 18 variables in the parent visitation project. Of these variables, 16 proved to be highly significant. Most dealt with the amount of parent participation in school activities. The results showed a sharp increase in parental knowledge of the role of the school and the nature of the school program. On the basis of this information, it was concluded that the project was successful and should be continued.

Analyses of both projects indicate that success is positively related to the length of time the project is in operation. Another finding also is that reading programs are more successful when they are conducted by specialized reading teachers using specialized equipment in separate facilities at specified times. Less successful are reading programs in which the regular teacher or an aide merely gives extra attention to a group of students.

Anecdotal Records from Project Reports

Anecdotes from district reports describing the attitudes, observations, and feelings of people involved in a variety of projects have been selected for their relevancy to the aims of the ESEA, Title I, projects.

Reading Program. In one reading program, a language skills teacher was assigned to each target-area school to work with groups of six to eight children each hour. At the end of the year, the district reported positive changes in the students' attitudes:

> In September 54 percent of the pupils were seen by classroom teachers as "rarely" or "sometimes" interested in classroom work; in May the percent was 25 percent. Of those whom teachers saw as exhibiting interest "often" or "usually," the percent went from 46 percent in September to 75 percent in May, with 48 percent "usually" showing interest.
>
> In September 58 percent of the pupils were seen by the language skills teachers as "rarely" or "sometimes" interested in classroom work; in May the percent was 14 percent. Of those whom the language skills teachers saw as exhibiting interest "often" or "usually," the percent went from 40 percent in September to 86 percent in May, with 51 percent "usually" showing interest.

Teacher Aides. Many districts employed teacher aides or assistants, often recruited from residents of the target area. Selected comments of teachers and administrators about teacher aides follow:

> I believe the use of teacher assistants has been the single most effective service possible under ESEA.
>
> Teacher assistants enable the teacher to have more time to counsel and motivate individual students.
>
> It has been very helpful in the arithmetic area to have the assisting teacher present. Prior to her arrival, there were two separate arithmetic groups, each working with a different book. It was sometimes difficult to make myself available to both groups at the same time. Now with the two teachers present, we can each work with a different group and help them when they need assistance. I feel that the children have profited from the contribution of the assisting teacher.

Reading Laboratory. A high school district which established a reading laboratory for students not achieving at grade level furnished the following report by the chairman of the English Department:

> Although delivery of most equipment and magazines was discouragingly slow, success of some of the projects was marked, particularly where the teachers had a real enthusiasm to impart to the students.

Encouragingly large numbers of paperback books were checked out by pupils, considering the normal lack of interest these students have for leisure reading. Some classes achieved an important amount of parent participation.

The Magazine Loan Service has been a real success. Particularly impressive to me was the use of news magazines by the students, who for the first time felt that they were aware of what was going on in the world and were interested in making research-type reports based on reading of several magazines.

One girl went from the ninth grade level to the twelfth grade level (in reading) in one semester. One boy jumped from the sixth grade level to the tenth grade level. Another girl gained 1.5 grade levels and another three grade levels.

Most important, I found through interviews that the majority of the students felt that they had made vast improvements in remembering what they had read. They also said that they now enjoyed reading.

Study Trip. A group of students in a San Joaquin Valley school district took a trip to Yosemite National Park. Before the trip, the students studied about the area; after their return, they spent additional time reviewing and evaluating their experiences. The children were deliberately selected so that the group would be a balanced representation of various social, ethnic, and economic groups. The following account was excerpted from the district's evaluation of the activity:

It was interesting and important to note that by far the most important aspects of the trip to Yosemite, as the children saw them, related to their opportunities to experience the natural and scenic wonders of that magnificent region. (a) Of 123 responses as to what the students considered to be "best" about their trip, only 9 listed "swimming" as compared to 88 who mentioned opportunities to see the waterfalls and other natural wonders. (b) It was interesting also that only 2 students even mentioned the "gift shop" as having been important while 32 expressed pleasure at having had the opportunity "of sleeping under the stars." This was considered especially important because one of the major generalizations often made concerning culturally disadvantaged children is that they are interested primarily in material stimuli or "things" which will provide immediate gratification. Certainly the data which were collected in this study suggested again and again to the evaluator that they were as sensitive to and appreciative of the beauty and inspiration of that which feeds the soul and not the "belly" as were their counterparts who have had much greater access to the social and economic bounties of life.

Hearing Defects. A school principal reported the long-range effects of a program to identify hearing defects of disadvantaged children:

> Besides discovering some hearing problems among our children and getting parental action on them, we have established one more link in our school-home relationship. For several families, this concern on the part of the school was just what it "took" to bring them into direct communication and cooperation with us.

Experimental Mathematics. High school students who had been chronic disciplinary problems were placed in an experimental mathematics class which was operated in a more permissive, less authoritarian manner than were regular classes. It was anticipated that elimination of student-teacher conflict would lead to greater achievement and acceptance of responsibility by the students. The district reported the following results:

> Most of the students did respond in a desired manner to the less authoritarian class and usually gave support to the teacher when discipline problems arose. It was necessary to remove seven students from class because they showed no inclination toward improvement in attitude or academic achievement. They constantly took advantage of the less authoritarian class to be disruptive.
>
> The large number of "A," "B," and "C" students (60 percent) stands as undisputed proof that a change in student attitudes was effected. All these students raised their grades one to three full grades due mainly to the fact that they were willing to come to class, do the assigned work, and conduct themselves in an acceptable fashion. The previous semester these same students had cut their math classes, refused to do the assigned work, and/or became intolerable discipline problems.

Attendance Project. An attendance worker who was employed to work with a small number of pupils and families in target-area schools reported as follows:

> A comparison was made of the percent of unexcused absences between the seventh, eighth, and ninth months of the 1964-65 school year and the 1965-66 school year. The overall average for the five elementary schools was a drop of one percent, from 15.4 percent to 14.4 percent. This may not seem like a great drop; however, there is some evidence that the population being dealt with in the schools would tend to result in an increased percent of unexcused absences rather than a decrease under normal conditions.
>
> It was further found that 52 percent of the high school students in the Title I reading program showed an improvement in attendance, while only 11 percent had poorer attendance records.

Staff Attitudes. Administrators and teachers reported that the attitudes of staff personnel toward disadvantaged children improved as a result of Title I activities. A teacher and an administrator commented as follows:

> According to these results, this young man has few problems when it comes to just reading for self-improvement. His vocabulary is good and his comprehension is strong. In choosing this boy for my study, I made the mistake of judging a stumbling style for a long while as faulty skills. This class has been a real EYE opener for me. It has shown me many of my areas of laxity. I have redone my reading program almost entirely during the past three months and there are still enough new and old ideas to incorporate for next year. It is very possible that these children may very well learn--in spite of us!

> We find a difference in those teachers participating in the reading course and those who are not. The difference is most pronounced in planning and teaching specific things for specific reading difficulties for the individual pupil. Reading has become more personalized and individualized. Teachers are searching for more effective techniques to help children.

Innovative ESEA, Title I, Projects

Several innovative projects were selected as examples of the wide range of activities and creative approaches in ESEA, Title I, projects in the 13 largest school districts.

Services for Expectant Mothers. Projects for school-age expectant mothers were operated in two of the 13 largest school districts. Activities were planned to provide educational, medical, social, and related services to school-age pregnant girls not enrolled in a regular school. The objectives of the programs were to offer group and individual counseling; to assist in the resolution of the many problems accompanying teen-age pregnancy; to ensure safe and effective prenatal and postnatal practices through health education; to offer instruction in the care and management of infants and young children; to counsel with the parents of pregnant girls and, if possible, with the fathers of the expected children; and to improve services to pregnant girls through cooperative efforts with health and welfare agencies.

A teacher-counselor and a school nurse gave instruction in basic academic subjects, health education, family living, and child care. The programs were conducted during the spring semester for four and a half months. The programs were evaluated in the terms of the student's knowledge of subject matter; improvement in personal appearance and hygiene, and improvement in attitudes and emotional behavior. As a result of the program, the girls indicated that they were motivated to continue their education. The program made them more optimistic about the future,

and their habits of personal appearance and hygiene improved noticeably. Numerous home calls were made by the nurse and the teacher-counselor to the families of the pregnant girls, and parental involvement was commendable.

More Capable Students. Three school districts offered a project designed to reveal the potential of the more capable students. The objectives of the program were to encourage and reinforce academic aptitude and to improve academic achievement, to establish a broad cultural background through inschool programs and study trips, to increase the horizons of talented students and their parents, to stimulate and to encourage such students to establish high goals for themselves, and to promote home-school relationships that would be conducive to a higher quality of education and aspiration.

The subjects most frequently involved in the supplementary instructional program were science, mathematics, written and oral language, and literature. Enrichment activities included writing in school newspapers, writing and performing in plays, conducting science experiments, making devices to demonstrate mathematics principles, and taking school journeys to places of civic and cultural interest. Multisensory aids, books, study trips, and visiting speakers were utilized to broaden the instructional program. Special science and audio-visual equipment was purchased to enrich, accelerate, and individualize the instructional program.

One school district indicated that its program was moderately successful. Another school district indicated that achievement and grades of students improved in ten subject areas. There was an indication that attitudes of students improved as a result of this program.

Student-Teacher Ratio. In another unusual program in grades one through three, one extra teacher was provided for each pair of classrooms. This program provided a team approach to reading and language instruction. With a few minor exceptions, each of the 11 participating elementary schools operated the program at the primary grade level. The purpose of this program was to reduce the student-teacher ratio, thus permitting increased teacher time and attention for the pupils. Two of the three teachers in the team were assigned to two classrooms as regular teachers. The third teacher was designated as the "swing" teacher and worked with children in one classroom for half of the day and with the children of the other classroom for the other half of the day.

The "swing" teacher's primary instructional responsibility was in the area of reading. All pupils in the program received instruction in reading two hours each day. Objective test results indicated that the children made significant gains in word meaning, paragraph meaning, word study skills, and spelling. The opinions of staff and parents generally confirmed the improvement of student achievement demonstrated by test scores. Teachers noted significant improvements in student attendance, motivation, and speaking skills.

Exploratory Work Experience. Selected students were enrolled in Exploratory Work Experience Education. In this elective course, they spent two hours of each school day at work stations in industries to obtain on-the-job experiences. Students were supervised by the employees of cooperating firms and by certificated school personnel. School credit was earned for work experience. Students were not paid a salary and did not replace paid employees. The objectives of this project were to give practical and applied vocational guidance to the students through work experience, to encourage the students to further their education by directly observing successful employees, to provide students with a satisfying experience through their success in an occupational setting, to promote acceptance of responsibility for regular performance of duties at a place of work, to demonstrate the duties involved in a variety of occupations, and to provide students with an opportunity to observe and work away from the school environment.

A total of 43 students, primarily from the eleventh and twelfth grades, participated in this program and worked at several local industrial companies, including International Business Machines, Southern California Edison Company, Pacific Telephone, Northrop-Norair, and Garrett Research. As a result of the work experience, 94 percent of the students indicated that they were more confident about getting a job after graduation from high school. In addition, 94 percent of the students indicated that they saw a greater need to stay in school. Parent reports indicated that 100 percent would recommend the program for other children who are undecided about the future, and 92 percent felt that their children's attitudes toward looking for a job or working for a living had improved as a result of the program.